



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/539,269	03/30/2000	Stephen R. Hanna	SUN-p4324-RSH	8981

22835 7590 02/19/2003

PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 SECOND STREET
SUITE 201
DAVIS, CA 95616

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 02/19/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/539,269	HANNA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David E. England	2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2000.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u>	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 30 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 29, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Arnold U.S. Patent No. 6275848.
2. Referencing claim 1, Arnold teaches a method for replacing an attachment to an email message with a reference to a location of the attachment, comprising:
 3. receiving the email message, (e.g. col. 1, lines 13 – 25);
 4. examining the email message to determine if the email message includes an attachment, (e.g. col. 2, lines 20 – 60); and
 5. if the email message includes the attachment,
 6. storing the attachment at a location on a communication network from which the attachment can be retrieved, (e.g. col. 2, lines 20 – 50),
 7. modifying the email message by replacing the attachment with a reference specifying the location of the attachment on the communication network, (e.g. col. 2, lines 20 – 50), and
 8. sending the modified email message to a recipient of the email message, (e.g. col. 2, lines 20 – 50).

Art Unit: 2143

9. Referencing claim 2, Arnold teaches receiving the modified email message at the recipient, (e.g. col. 2, lines 20 – 50); and
10. using the reference specifying the location of the attachment to retrieve the attachment across the communication network, (e.g. col. 2, lines 20 – 50).
11. Referencing claim 9, Arnold teaches wherein the attachment is a file, (e.g. col. 2, lines 20 – 50).
12. Referencing claim 10, Arnold teaches the reference specifying the location of the attachment includes a uniform resource locator (URL), (e.g. col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 5).
13. Claims 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 29, 30 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
15. Claims 3 – 5, 8, 13 – 15, 18, 23 – 25, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold (6275848) in view of Eldridge et al. (6397361) (hereinafter Eldridge).
16. As per claim 3, Arnold does not specifically teach retrieving the attachment includes authenticating the recipient to a computer system upon which the attachment is stored. Eldridge teaches retrieving the attachment includes authenticating the recipient to a computer system upon which the attachment is stored, (e.g. col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 2143

made to combine Eldridge with Arnold because it would be more secure if the user utilized an authentication system in the invention so to keep unauthorized users from accessing attachments that are private in nature.

17. As per claim 4, Arnold does not specifically teach receiving the email message includes receiving the email message at one of,

18. an application residing on a computer system belonging to a sender of the email message;

19. an email server through which the email message is sent;

20. a firewall that protects at least one trusted computer system from communications across the communication network; and

21. a gateway that converts the email message from a first format to a second format. Eldridge teaches receiving the email message includes receiving the email message at one of,

22. an application residing on a computer system belonging to a sender of the email message, (e.g. col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 64);

23. an email server through which the email message is sent, (e.g. col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 64);

24. a firewall that protects at least one trusted computer system from communications across the communication network, (e.g. col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 64); and

25. a gateway that converts the email message from a first format to a second format, (e.g. col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Eldridge with Arnold because the system would be more secure if the email were to go through some type of security point to prevent unauthorized email to enter different domains or systems so not to corrupt or damage any system from working, also, if needed, a second format would be needed if different protocols were implemented in the system that the email is being sent to making the system more versatile in accepting different types of network transport formats. Furthermore, having the system with an email server

Art Unit: 2143

with a user having an application residing on a computer system belonging to a sender of the email message would be more convenient because it is a common practice in email technology.

26. As per claim 5, Arnold does not specifically teach allowing the attachment to be updated at the location on the communication network. Eldridge teaches allowing the attachment to be updated at the location on the communication network, (e.g. col. 17, lines 8 – 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Eldridge with Arnold because if the attachment is old and newer versions of the attachment were available, it would be more efficient for a system to have an updated version of the attachment incase of important information that was added can be viewed and not missed.

27. As per claim 8, Arnold does not specifically teach if the email message includes the attachment, the method further comprises:

28. asking a sender of the email message whether to replace the attachment with the reference specifying the location of the attachment; and

29. replacing the attachment only if the sender agrees to replace the attachment. Eldridge teaches if the email message includes the attachment, the method further comprises:

30. asking a sender of the email message whether to replace the attachment with the reference specifying the location of the attachment, (e.g. col. 7, lines 15 – 58); and

31. replacing the attachment only if the sender agrees to replace the attachment, (e.g. col. 7, lines 15 – 58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Eldridge with Arnold because it would be more convenient for a user to have the option to replace the attachment if there is one present and/or the attachment is not a too big, causing a potential error in transmission.

32. Claims 8, 13 – 15, 18, 23 – 25, and 28 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
33. Claims 6, 16, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold (6275848) in view of Pollack (6505236) in further view of Trenbeath et al. (6324587) (hereinafter Trenbeath) in further view of Birrell et al. (6092101) (hereinafter Birrell).
34. As per claim 6, Arnold does teach the deletion of attachments, (e.g. col. 2, line 20 – 50), but does not specifically teach deleting the attachment from the location on the communication network after at least one of:
 35. an expiration of a time period;
 36. sending a notification to recipients of the email message that the attachment is to be deleted;
 37. receiving a notification that all recipients of the email message have retrieved the attachment;
 38. receiving a notification that all recipients of the email message have deleted the email message;
 39. receiving a command to delete the attachment from a sender of the email message; and
 40. storing the attachment to archival storage. Pollack teaches deleting the attachment from the location on the communication network after at least one of:
 41. an expiration of a time period, (e.g. col. 2, lines 26 – 57);
 42. receiving a notification that all recipients of the email message have retrieved the attachment, (e.g. col. 3, lines 3 – 25);
 43. receiving a notification that all recipients of the email message have deleted the email message, (e.g. col. 2, lines 26 – 57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pollack with Arnold because it would be more efficient if the system had a way to delete information that is old and no longer being used by the user. Furthermore, it would be more efficient for the system to have a notification sent out to all users so a user would know when his attachment is no longer on in the system.

44. Pollack does not specifically teach sending a notification to recipients of the email message that the attachment is to be deleted;
45. receiving a command to delete the attachment from a sender of the email message; and
46. storing the attachment to archival storage. Trenbeath teaches sending a notification to recipients of the email message that the attachment is to be deleted, (e.g. col. 9, lines 19 – 35);
47. receiving a command to delete the attachment from a sender of the email message, (e.g. col. 29, line 60 – col. 30, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Trenbeath with the combine system of Arnold and Pollack because of similar reasons as stated above. Trenbeath does not teach storing the attachment to archival storage. Birrell teaches storing the attachment to archival storage, (e.g. col. 1, lines 51 – 59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Birrell with the combine system of Arnold, Pollack and Trenbeath because if a user needed the information that was old for historic reference then it would be more efficient if the user had an option of storing the attachment in a different location, (i.e. personal folder), so to free up space for other user's attachments that are not old.
48. Claims 16 and 26 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
49. Claims 7, 17, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold (6275848) in view of Birrell (6092101).
50. As per claim 7, Arnold teaches the communication network includes at least one of:
51. a computer network, (e.g. col. 3, lines 51 – 56), but does not specifically teach a telephone network. Birrell teaches a telephone network, (e.g. col. 4, lines 26 – 36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Birrell with Arnold because it would be more

versatile for a user to utilize the system on a two potentially different types of networks, LANs and dial-up networks. This would make the system more available for users in a work environment or a personal home environment.

52. Claims 17 and 27 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

53.

54. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

55. a. Chang et al. U.S. Patent No. 6292825 discloses Service application with pull notification.

56. b. Ji et al. U.S. Patent No. 5889943 discloses Apparatus and method for electronic mail virus detection and elimination.

57. c. Pelletier U.S. Patent No. 5579519 discloses Extensible electronic document processing system for creating new classes of active documents.

58. d. Marchak et al. U.S. Patent No. 6138104 discloses Product development system and method using integrated process and data management.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular communications and none for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De *DE*
February 5, 2003



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100